DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 592 PS 014 344

AUTHOR Herman, Barry E.
TITLE The Case for the All-Day Kindergarten. Fastback 205.
INSTITUTION Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Ind.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-87367-205-4
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 38p.; This fastback was sponsored by the Indianapolis Indiana Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa.
AVAILABLE FROM Phi Delta Kappa, Eighth Street and Union Avenue, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402 ($0.75).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Administrator Attitudes; Check Lists; Classroom Research; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Opportunities; Emotional Problems; *Kindergarten; Learning Problems; *Parent Attitudes; School Readiness; Screening Tests; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Connecticut (New Haven); *Full Day Programs

ABSTRACT

Discussion in support of the all-day kindergarten is provided in this pamphlet. Following an introductory description of program rationale, the first section outlines the arguments for and against all-day kindergarten programs. Various research in support of such programs is cited in the second section. The third section reports the commitment in New Haven, Connecticut to the all-day program by listing 15 recommendations submitted to the Board of Education. Procedures for prescreening and postscreening of students are also described. The fourth section identifies typical emotional and learning problems associated with children in all-day kindergartens. A checklist for establishing an all-day kindergarten program is included in the fifth section, while the concluding section cites several facts in support of implementing such arrangements. (BJD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED243592

FASTBACK 205

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PS 014344

The Case for the All-Day Kindergarten

Barry E. Herman

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Phi Delta Kappa (PDK)
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PHI DELTA KAPPA
EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

2

BARRY E. HERMAN

Barry E. Herman has served the New Haven Public Schools as director of Early Childhood and Head Start, district director K-8, principal, assistant principal, curriculum service teacher, and elementary teacher. He has also taught education courses part-time at Southern Connecticut State College. His Ph.D. in educational administration and supervision is from the University of Connecticut. During the 1982-83 academic year he was awarded a Bush Fellowship to study at the Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy at Yale University. Currently, he is the director of reading K-12 and language arts K-6 for the New Haven School System.

Herman is the author of fastback 101 *Winchester, A Community School for the Urbanvantaged* and *Jews in New Haven, Volume II* and is co-author of Volume III in that series. He has contributed material to five books and has written over 100 articles for leading education journals. He is listed in *Community Leaders of America* and *Leaders of American Elementary and Secondary Education*. Herman currently serves on the New Haven mayor's Day Care Task Force.

The Case for the All-Day Kindergarten

by
Barry E. Herman

PS 014344

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 83-83087
ISBN 0-87367-205-4
Copyright © 1984 by the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana

This fastback is sponsored by the Indianapolis Indiana Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, which made a generous contribution toward publication costs.

The chapter sponsors the fastback to acknowledge the collective efforts of educators in behalf of quality education for the children of Indiana.

Table of Contents

Introduction 7

Arguments Pro and Con for All-Day Kindergarten 10
Arguments Against the All-Day Kindergarten 11

What Does Research Say About the All-Day Kindergarten? 14

New Haven's Commitment to the All-Day Kindergarten in the Early Childhood Continuum 20
Screening for the All-Day Kindergarten 23
The Post-Kindergarten Screen 25

Typical Emotional and Learning Problems in the All-Day Kindergarten 28

A Checklist for Establishing an All-Day Kindergarten 30

Conclusion 32

Bibliography 35

Introduction

It was mid-afternoon and five-year-old Susan was trying on hats; she skipped over to show her teacher how she looked. Mark was painting a large house with faces in every window. Steve was building a tower of blocks, which was beginning to totter. I thought these all-day kindergarten children would be tired by this time and I commented to the teacher, "Don't all-day kindergartners get tired in the afternoon?" The teacher replied, "Sure, we're all tired at the beginning of the school year; but by October our biological time-clocks catch up and we all adjust to the longer school day."

All-day kindergarten or extended-day kindergarten is an emerging national trend and a new educational reality for the 1980s. Although a few school districts such as Oakland, California, have had full-day "playschools" for more than 40 years, the vast majority of districts have offered only half-day classes until recently. But now in response to changes in the American family and because of changing attitudes among early childhood educators, many school districts are beginning to try some form of extended-day program for kindergarten-age youngsters.

Stamford, Connecticut, established a pilot all-day kindergarten program in 1979-80, which administrators, teachers, and parents all agreed was successful. So in 1980-81 the school system instituted all-day kindergarten programs in every elementary school. Other school systems with all-day kindergarten programs include: Jefferson County, Colorado; Tuscon, Arizona; Wymore, Nebraska; Des Moines, Iowa;

St. Paul, Minnesota; and the State of Hawaii. Other school systems such as Brookline, Massachusetts; Atlanta, Georgia; Pickens County, South Carolina; and Austin, Texas, operate extended-day and after-school day-care programs for kindergarten-age children.

Children who enter kindergarten today are different from those of a decade or two ago. Many have attended such programs as Head Start, nursery school, and day care. In addition, such social factors as television, working mothers, and one-parent homes have all contributed to young children's social maturity, self-awareness, independence, and a sophistication not known a decade ago. The world of young children has changed and they have changed with it.

The traditional function of kindergarten has been to prepare young children socially and emotionally for their first school experience. For many that function has been fulfilled by the pre-kindergarten, nursery school, day-care center, or Head Start class. For these children the function of the kindergarten must change. It must take into account the

All-day kindergarten teacher Regina Riello, with help from a parent volunteer, begins an art lesson at West Hills Follow Through School.



Gwen Ocoma helps all-day kindergarten children learn letters and letter sounds at Helene Grant School.

widely diverse abilities and experiences of today's young children and focus not only on the social, affective, and physical, but also on the cognitive areas of learning. It must provide identification and remediation of early learning deficiencies as well as individualized instruction according to each child's needs. In short, the new function requires more instructional time and better instructional tools than presently exist in traditional half-day kindergarten programs. The kindergarten can no longer be viewed as an isolated experience; it is part of the early childhood education continuum involving pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and the primary grades.

Arguments Pro and Con for All-Day Kindergarten

The kindergarten year should be a happy experience during which a child develops a positive self-image and a respect for others. The all-day kindergarten provides time for the variety of educational activities necessary to meet the different academic, social, emotional, and physical needs of each child. The pace of an all-day kindergarten program is a more comfortable and productive one for children and teachers.

Kindergarten teachers cite the following advantages for all-day kindergarten classes: longer blocks of uninterrupted time for learning experiences; more time to diagnose children's needs and interests; more time for students who need remedial help; more time to develop stronger social relationships with other children; more time for individualization and small group instruction; and more time for teaching readiness skills in language arts, reading, and mathematics.

Many principals feel the all-day kindergarten allows teachers to undertake more creative and enriching experiences such as science, cooking, art, music, physical education, dramatics, and field trips. Kindergarten teachers can also use lunch period to stress nutrition, manners, and good eating habits and to involve children in a social family setting. With all-day kindergarten, children can participate in assemblies and other cultural programs scheduled for the school.

Many parents feel the all-day kindergarten class provides a more structured and well-balanced day program for children. Since many children now attend a half-day kindergarten program and go to a day-

care center in the afternoon or in the morning or end up with a baby sitter, there are just too many interruptions in the daily schedule and too many different people involved with the young children. Another problem expressed by parents is the fear of leaving little children unsupervised in the afternoon until an older sibling comes home from school.

Many early childhood experts, school social workers, and psychologists now feel that most five-year-olds are ready for an all-day kindergarten program. They cite the high number of preschool youngsters now attending all-day programs in Head Start, day care, or nursery school. When these children are a year older and attend kindergarten for only a half day, they often find the program boring and unproductive. Many of these children literally become "drop-outs" in kindergarten.

Administrators cite some financial advantages for the all-day kindergarten. Savings in transportation costs are possible because a separate bus run would not be needed to take morning children home and to pick up afternoon children. Crossing guards would not have to be hired for the end of the morning session and for the beginning of the afternoon session. And a school system would receive more state aid with all-day students.

Another advantage of interest to administrators has to do with declining enrollments and empty classrooms. An all-day kindergarten can raise a school's enrollment, can occupy empty classrooms, and possibly keep a popular neighborhood school open after it has been scheduled to be closed. In New Haven and other communities many parents are enrolling their children in private and parochial schools that have all-day kindergarten programs, and once enrolled they tend to keep them in these schools, never to return to the public schools.

Arguments Against the All-Day Kindergarten

There are some legitimate concerns about the all-day kindergarten. They are discussed below with responses that could alleviate such concerns.

A full-day program may be too long for some children. Young children become tired. This can be resolved by having a rest period after

lunch and structuring the day to alternate active with restful activities. Those children not ready for an all-day experience could start for a half day and then gradually increase their time in class as the year progresses. The kindergarten lends itself to this type of flexible scheduling.

Young children can be turned off if an all-day program is not varied and stimulating. An all-day program will need energetic and creative teachers who can plan and pace appropriate activities. This might require inservice programs to plan a new curriculum. Here is an opportunity for teachers, administrators, and parents to plan cooperatively, with help from early childhood experts from nearby colleges.

Working parents might regard the all-day kindergarten as a baby-sitting agency. At parent orientation sessions prior to registration and at PTA meetings throughout the year, there should be an emphasis on the importance of kindergarten as the basis for continuing success in school and an emphasis on parents' roles in early childhood education. Other



All-day kindergarten teacher Regina Riello's students learn about caring for animals and pets at West Hills Follow Through School.

parents may not see the need for an all-day program because of rich, stimulating experiences in the home. To these parents, it should be pointed out that in most states kindergarten is not a mandatory requirement, and if they choose not to take advantage of the opportunity, that is their option.

Some will object to the added expense needed to hire extra teachers and possibly teacher aides. To answer this argument calls for a full-scale public relations program in the media, in community clubs, and in the churches and synagogues to sell the public on the importance of a sound early childhood experience that an all-day kindergarten provides.

Some fear that teachers may tend to impose a structured reading and mathematics curriculum on children who are not ready for the full academic program. It should be made clear that an all-day kindergarten should not become a mini-first grade.

At the 1980 New England Kindergarten Conference, sponsored by Lesley College in Boston, a panel of teachers, a principal, and a state department of education consultant discussed the topic: "The All-Day Kindergarten: A Cost Effective Approach Toward Improvement of Educational Experiences for Young Children." The panel concluded that the advantages of all-day kindergarten clearly outweigh the disadvantages. All-day kindergarten teachers in the audience were in agreement that their children benefited in cognitive and affective areas by attending kindergarten all day.

What Does Research Say About the All-Day Kindergarten?

Despite considerable interest in all-day kindergartens, comparatively little research has addressed the issue of all-day versus half-day programs. The few studies that have been conducted are inconclusive.

One three-year study by Annabelle Mouw (1976), involving children assigned randomly to either an all-day or to a half-day kindergarten program, found no academic differences in the two groups at the end of the first grade. Mouw concluded that all-day kindergartens could not be recommended solely on the basis of academic considerations.

Another study comparing children in all-day and half-day kindergartens, conducted by the Cincinnati Public School System (1971), found that children in all-day kindergartens had significantly higher reading readiness scores at the end of their kindergarten year. This study concluded that all-day kindergarten does produce substantial academic benefits.

Barbato (1980) reported that two pilot all-day kindergarten classes instituted in a New Jersey school system showed that the flow of the kindergarten curriculum benefited from the lengthened school day. School people and parents were so pleased with the full-day kindergarten program that the school board voted to continue the program and expand it to other schools during the next school year.

A study by Winter and Klein (1970) found that signs of fatigue, frustration, or waning interest in school simply did not appear in pupils attending an all-day kindergarten program. In fact, a far higher percentage of children in the all-day program experienced very positive feelings about school than did children in the traditional half-day program.

An argument often used to oppose all-day kindergarten is parents' alleged fear that the school will replace the home. Hess and others (1978) found all-day kindergarten can actually create a closer cooperation between home and school.

Two studies that report significant gains for children attending all-day kindergarten compared to half-day kindergarten involved parents being used extensively in the instructional process. The two studies by Winter and Klein (1970) and Alper and Wright (1979) also found that parents prefer all-day over half-day kindergarten for reasons of convenience: easier arrangements for children's transportation, baby-sitting, and parents' daily routine being consistent.

Kindergarten teachers appear overwhelmingly to prefer an all-day program to two half-day sessions according to Ross (1976). Harris (1969) pointed out that it becomes physically and mentally exhausting

West Hills Follow Through teacher Linda Bradford stresses positive social skills with her class.

for a teacher to meet the needs and interests of two groups of children in one day. Teachers who teach in all-day programs report that they are able to use the extra time to work more with individual students.

To a school board and superintendent, cost of all-day kindergarten is a critical consideration. While the initial expense may be greater, Gorton and Robinson (1968) report that it can be offset by the school district obtaining full state aid for each child. According to Naron (1981), costs for supplies and maintenance need not increase and may even decrease, because fewer children will be using each room and its equipment. Naron also reports that costs for meals will not greatly increase, because the noon meal could replace the two sets of snacks usually provided in the present half-day situation. Also, in many communities, the state or federal government subsidizes school lunches but not snacks. There will also be a substantial savings in transportation fuel costs with the noon trip eliminated. The Quillayute Valley School District No. 402 in Forks, Washington, reported substantial savings in transportation fuel costs in 1980-81 for all-day kindergartens compared to half-day kindergartens in 1979-80.

Naron (1978) found that a program of early identification and treatment of learning deficits could save a large urban school district such as Chicago as much as a million dollars a year by reducing the need for special education services later on.

An extended-day, five-hour kindergarten program was piloted in Phoenix, Arizona, to provide more time for individualized instruction and to increase parent participation in instruction. In addition to achieving these goals, Alper and Wright (1979) found the extended-day children performed substantially higher on the *Metropolitan Readiness Test*. In the same study, participation in the school lunch program was cited as being a major benefit for disadvantaged children.

The Rhinelander, Wisconsin, School District (1976) implemented an alternate-day, all-day program as a means to eliminate noon bus transportation expenses. One group attended all day on Monday, Wednesday, Friday; and the other group all day on Tuesday and Thursday. The groups then switched days on alternating weeks. Measured achievement was not significantly different, probably because total instructional time had not changed; however, two questions were re-

solved: transportation costs were reduced, and it was shown that five-year-olds were able to sustain the all-day program. The alternate-day kindergarten program is another variation of an all-day kindergarten program in some school systems.

None of the studies cited so far followed children in different types of kindergarten programs for more than two years, so they provide no data on whether all-day kindergarten has long-term effects or effects that become evident only in later years. Moreover, most of the studies focus only on academic achievement and provide no data on possible



Assistant teacher Minnie Jackson supervises creative block building at Helene Grant School.

social, motivational, or attitudinal effects of all-day kindergarten on young children. However, a new study reported in the Education Research Service *Bulletin* (Humphrey, 1980) avoids some of the pitfalls of earlier research. Not only is the research question more focused but standardized tests were given to kindergarten children to measure a variety of developmental characteristics. A follow-up test was also conducted when the children were in first grade. The study took place in Evansville, Indiana. Educators there decided to evaluate the effectiveness of a full-day compared to a half-day kindergarten program.

In their report, *A Study of the Effectiveness of Full-Day Kindergarten* (Humphrey, 1980), they note that many of today's children have had broader experiences than children in the past through exposure to nursery school, Head Start, and television; and increasingly kindergarten teachers are building on this experience with formal lessons in readiness skills for reading, writing, and mathematics, along with informal learning approaches emphasizing affective and linguistic development. In order to determine whether children who attend full-day kindergarten show greater growth in cognitive, psychomotor, affective, and linguistic skills than children who attend half-day kindergarten, Evansville initiated a pilot, full-day kindergarten program in four of their 30 elementary schools.

Results from the pilot study showed full-day kindergarten children received higher scores on the *California Achievement Tests* and on the *Boehm Tests of Basic Concepts*. In addition, when full-day kindergarten students were tested in first grade, they scored significantly higher on the *Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests* than children who attended half-day kindergarten. No significant difference was found in attendance patterns for the two groups. A survey of parents and teachers involved with the full-day program found that they were pleased with its format.

The study reported the main advantages of the full-day program to be increased time for more formal and informal learning; greater enrichment in music, art, and physical education; more individual help; increased participation in other school activities such as assemblies; and more social interaction with adults and children. The main disadvantages of the program, according to the authors, were increased class size

and more responsibility and work for the kindergarten teachers. The study recommended that parents be given the option of having their children attend half-day at a school that also offers a full-day program, or of having their children attend an adjacent school that offers only a half-day program.

Bilingual all-day kindergarten teacher Doris Suarez at Welch Annex School teaches the morning story in Spanish.

19

New Haven's Commitment to the All-Day Kindergarten in the Early Childhood Continuum

The New Haven Board of Education has made a commitment to strengthen the entire area of early childhood education. I was appointed the first director of Early Childhood Education and Head Start by the superintendent to organize a broad-based Early Childhood/All-Day Kindergarten Task Force to study and make recommendations for an all-day kindergarten program for New Haven in 1981-82. The task force was made up of administrators, kindergarten teachers, primary teachers, psychologists, parents, early childhood specialists from nearby colleges, and others. The task force was organized into subcommittees and after a year of intensive work it made the following recommendations to the New Haven Board of Education:

1. The all-day kindergarten program should be an essential part of a developing early childhood primary continuum from pre-kindergarten through grade four.

2. All-day kindergarten classes should be initiated in 10 pilot classrooms in the 1981-82 school year with full implementation of all recommendations, i.e., full-time aides, funding, inservice training, supplies, etc. If there were budgetary constraints, the number of classrooms could be reduced but not the needed services.

3. All-day kindergarten classes should be implemented in all elementary schools for the 1982-83 school year with full services provided as stated in #2 above.

4. All children entering all-day or half-day kindergarten classes in 1981-82 would be given a pre-screening assessment during the first eight days in September. School would start for all kindergarten children on the Monday after the screening assessment was completed.

5. The *Clifford Beers Pre-Kindergarten Screen* instrument would be used because it provides valuable information concerning child development, serves as a sound basis for individualized programming, and can be administered by the classroom teacher.

6. Inservice training should be given to all kindergarten teachers and assistant teachers to familiarize them with the *Beers Pre-Kindergarten Screen* instrument, the program development sequence, the all-day kindergarten structure, and the team approach involving teachers and assistants. The inservice training would include a day of released time in June prior to implementation of the program, a day of released time in September, and citywide sessions throughout the year.

All-day kindergarten teacher Franklin Luena teaches students their colors at Katherine Brennan School.

21

7. Class size for an all-day kindergarten should be limited to 20 children in order to ensure that each child receives individual attention in this new program.

8. Each all-day kindergarten classroom should be staffed with a full-time trained assistant teacher, preferably a parent or community person.

9. Appropriate funds should be allocated as start-up costs for each new all-day kindergarten classroom to purchase supplies, furniture, equipment, carpeting, cots, and library books.

10. A reading readiness test (post-kindergarten screen) should be given to each kindergarten child in June of each year in preparation for placement and programming for the following year in first grade.

11. Provisions should be made for a longitudinal evaluation comparing those children who attended an all-day kindergarten program with those who attended a half-day kindergarten program.

12. An on-going kindergarten support group should be organized made up of teachers, administrators, assistant teachers, and parents to work closely with the director of Early Childhood Education to maintain continuity, disseminate information, plan inservice sessions, keep lines of communication open, and sustain the developing all-day kindergarten program as part of the early childhood continuum.

13. The following community and school resources should be utilized: early childhood majors and faculty specialists from Southern Connecticut State College, Yale University, and South Central Community College; selected high school seniors interested in early childhood education; school volunteers, parents, grandparents, senior citizens, and retired primary teachers.

14. A committee should be formed to review the existing system of reporting progress for the kindergarten and to adopt an appropriate progress report card for the all-day kindergarten program.

15. All kindergarten children would attend the first two weeks of school for only a half day in order to become gradually acclimated to an all-day kindergarten program.

The Board of Education and the superintendent unanimously accepted the report and recommendations of the task force and voted to initiate eight pilot all-day kindergarten classes for 1981-82. The *Clifford*

Beers Pre-Kindergarten Screen was adopted and used to screen more than 1,400 incoming kindergarten children. The screen was also used in September 1982. The *Monroe Reading Readiness Test* was used in late May 1982 to assess each kindergarten child before being promoted to first grade. Serious budget constraints curtailed more pilot programs in 1982-83.

Screening for the All-Day Kindergarten

Essential to establishing an all-day kindergarten is a procedure for gathering developmental data about each child that can be used in program planning and in making decisions about school entrance. Such information is commonly gathered through a pre-kindergarten screening, which includes a parent interview for learning the child's family history.

There are many good pre-kindergarten screens available commercially. Some of the better known ones are: *Brigance, Gesell, McCarthy, Addison-Wesley, Education Programmers, Starr RR Test, Meriden Screen, Pennsylvania Screen, Clifford Beers Screen, Slingerland,*

Building time at Welch Annex School for three "future engineers" in Donna Carerra's all-day kindergarten class.

23

Brookline Massachusetts Screen, Economy Company Screen, AGS Screen, and *Santa Clara Screen*.

New Haven chose the *Clifford Beers Pre-kindergarten Screen* because its component sections seemed to fit the needs of our urban population. Also, one of the screen's developers, Lois Davis, lives in the area and offered to provide inservice training for our teachers and to serve as a consultant during the screening process. The *Clifford Beers Pre-kindergarten Screen* provides assessment in the following areas:

1. Expressive and receptive language
2. Gross and fine motor skills
3. Visual and auditory skills
4. Non-verbal and verbal cognitives
5. Adaptive behavior (social interaction)
6. Parent interview (pre-natal, post-natal, and family history)
7. Analogies, number concepts, puzzle solving, and memory skills

New Haven's Early Childhood/All-Day Kindergarten Task Force unanimously chose the *Clifford Beers Screen* with the *McCarthy Screen* as a second choice. The task force cited the following as advantages in using the *Clifford Beers Screen*:

1. It provides the information needed in a pre-kindergarten assessment.
2. It can be used as both a readiness and developmental tool. An individualized prescriptive program can be developed based on the results of this screen.
3. It was already familiar to most of our kindergarten teachers since it had been used a few years before.
4. One of the developers of the screen lived in the New Haven area and would be available to provide inservice training and to serve as a consultant.
5. It covers many skill areas usually covered in an early childhood curriculum.
6. It is easy for any teacher to administer.
7. It gave more information about a child's strengths and weaknesses than many other screens.

24

The only reservation the task force had about using the screen was the amount of time (45-55 minutes) required to administer the screening of each child. Lois Davis is working on a shorter version.

Some school systems give released time at the beginning of the school year for teachers to screen the incoming kindergarten children. Others pay teachers to do it a week before the opening of school. While many school systems have school psychologists conduct the screening, I believe that kindergarten teachers should do it themselves. Since they will be teaching these same children, it helps them to get to know a child's strengths and weaknesses and they can adjust the programs to meet individual needs. School budgets and availability of teacher's time will dictate when and by whom the screening will take place.

The Post-Kindergarten Screen

The post-kindergarten screen is used to determine reading readiness. Reading readiness involves the youngster's ability to distinguish sounds, to make discriminations in visual symbols, and to express simple ideas,



Bilingual all-day kindergarten children at Welch Annex begin free-choice time.

as well as skill in left-to-right progression and the ability to follow simple oral directions. Many children reach this stage in first grade, but some indicate a readiness to read in kindergarten. Therefore, it is important at the end of the kindergarten year to screen each child and to assess cognitive readiness abilities.

The information learned from the reading readiness test can be used to predict a child's potential for academic progress. This test can also indicate a child's learning style and motivational traits. The first-grade teacher can use the results of the test to plan an appropriate first-grade program for each child or group of children. A low score on a reading readiness test may indicate retention in kindergarten or placement in a reading readiness class. The additional time for readiness experiences in an all-day kindergarten class would probably eliminate the need for kindergarten retention or placement in a reading readiness class.

Most reading readiness tests will include the following sections: visual discrimination, auditory discrimination, visual-motor coordina-

Teacher Lynn Pastore has dress-up time with Helene Grant School all-day kindergarten students.

tion, following directions, letter recognition, and listening comprehension. The New Haven school system uses the *Monroe Reading Readiness Test*, which is given to all kindergarten students in late May or early June each year. This test has a proven reliability and has been used nationwide by many school systems for many years. The results from a reading readiness test or post-kindergarten screen are useless if the scores and results are not used carefully by the teachers to plan appropriate programs for children based on a diagnosis of needs, strengths, and weaknesses.

27

Typical Emotional and Learning Problems in the All-Day Kindergarten

Children come to kindergarten with mental ages ranging from three to eight. Developmental lags in language, motor, or perceptual skills are not uncommon, even in kindergartners of average or above average intelligence. Physical, emotional, and behavioral factors hamper the ability of some five-year-olds to learn. So do such factors as family size, family stability, and experiential background. Thus not all kindergartners are ready for first grade when they reach age 6. Some need more time to prepare and to grow if they are to avoid early academic failure and poor self-concepts. Solem (1981) has identified the following common problems among kindergartners:

- *Hyperactivity.* The child cannot sit still, lacks organization. He or she may be over-aggressive or too shy.
- *Perceptual/motor deficiencies.* The child has poor coordination and is clumsy in the use of pencils, scissors, crayons, and other implements.
- *Daydreaming.* The child is slow to react, fails to tune in.
- *Short attention span.* The child has difficulty concentrating and is easily distracted.
- *Impulsiveness.* The child does things without thinking, regardless of consequences.
- *Memory/thinking disorders.* The child is unable to recall and makes inappropriate responses.
- *Perseveration.* The child compulsively repeats a word, a phrase, a drawing, and is unable to change activities readily.

Rest time in an all-day kindergarten classroom.

- *Speech/language/hearing disorders.* The child reverses words, phrases, numbers, letters; speaks inarticulately; or fails to comprehend or respond to verbal instructions.
- *Generally poor attitude toward self or school.* The child seldom participates in instructional or social activities.

When most kindergarten children exhibit the above problems they are usually sent to a transition class, a special class between kindergarten and first grade. Many parents feel such a class has a stigma and regard it as a form of retention for their child. With a longer school day, kindergarten teachers would have more time to spend diagnosing children's needs and could work on solving problems before they pass on to first grade.

29

A Checklist for Establishing an All-Day Kindergarten

There are several things a school district must do to implement an all-day kindergarten program. Foremost is establishing an educational justification for expansion of the traditional half-day kindergarten program to an all-day program. Below is a checklist of things to do when planning for an all-day kindergarten program:*

1. Identify and prioritize the educational justifications for an all-day program.
2. Project kindergarten enrollment for the next three years.
3. Study school buildings, school organization, and classroom space.
4. Establish an entrance age policy.
5. Revise or develop a pre-kindergarten screening assessment for all incoming kindergarten children.
6. Estimate additional costs for professional staff, paraprofessional staff, non-professional staff, and inservice programs.
7. Review transportation implications.
8. Purchase needed classroom equipment, furniture, and supplies.
9. Develop curriculum for the longer school day.
10. Plan for expansion of the school lunch program.
11. Develop a post-kindergarten screening assessment or reading readiness test to use with all kindergarten children prior to promotion to first grade.

**This checklist has been modified from one developed by William Cieslukowski, principal of Memorial Elementary School, East Hampton, Connecticut (1981).*

12. Collect data and articles about already existing all-day kindergarten programs in other communities.
13. Visit nearby communities where successful all-day kindergarten programs are in operation.
14. Organize a communitywide all-day kindergarten task force to study this area and to make specific recommendations.
15. Try pilot programs first — school sites, number of students involved, selection of students, evaluation instruments, and selection of staff.

Lunch time for Paula Samuel's all-day kindergarten children at Welch Annex School.

Conclusion

In 1980 almost 96% of all five-year-olds (2.5 million children) were attending kindergarten compared to 85% in 1965 (Criscuolo 1982). Most of these children attend kindergarten on a half-day basis.

Many of the social and learning activities commonly found in the traditional half-day kindergarten are already part of pre-school children's experiences in nursery school, day-care centers, and Head Start. These children are ready for a richer and more diversified program, which an all-day kindergarten program can provide. The evidence clearly indicates that many young children, particularly our urban poor, will experience greater success in school if they are provided a well-planned, all-day kindergarten program.

Music teacher Marion Kollar teaches new songs to West Hills Follow Through all-day kindergarten children.

Support for the all-day kindergarten has come from the National Association for the Education of Young Children, the American Federation of Teachers, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the American Association of School Administrators. In 1970 the American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators passed a resolution that "a full-day kindergarten be available to all children, organized flexibly to accommodate the needs of kindergarten children and teachers." Urie Bronfenbrenner (1975) has recommended that expanded kindergarten be made an "integral" part of the public schools, which can be successfully implemented only with a massive, publicly administered program.

In the face of financial constraints, economic uncertainty, declining enrollments, and limited community resources, school administrators must make some difficult choices in allocating their resources — choices that are both educationally sound and acceptable to the community. Establishing an all-day kindergarten will require careful research,

Measurement and math skills being learned at the sand table, West Hills Follow Through all-day kindergarten class.

systematic planning, and community involvement. The payoff will be a stimulating and creative educational environment for young children, which serves as a basis for future school success. A child in a traditional half-day kindergarten class said it best when he told me, "I hate coming to school for just half a day. I wish I could be here all day."

34

Bibliography

Alper, Carol L., and Wright, Donald. "Extended Day Kindergarten Plus Parent Involvement: A Combination that Works." *Phi Delta Kappan* 61 (September 1979).

Ballain, Myron L. "Alternate-Day Kindergarten: An Example of Decision-Making." Wymore, Nebraska: Southern Pacific Schools, 1978.

Barbato, Guy. "All-Day, Every-Day Kindergarten." *Early Years* 11 (August/September 1980).

Berson, Minnie P. "The All-Day Kindergarten" *Today's Education* 57 (November 1968).

Bloom, Benjamin S. *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Brodinsky, Ben. "A Shortened Day for First Graders?" *Today's Education* 69 (February/March 1980).

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Is Early Intervention Effective?" In *Influences on Human Development.* Edited by Bronfenbrenner and Maloney. Hinsdale, Ill.: The Dryden Press, 1975.

Cieslukowski, William. *Full-Day Kindergarten Survey Report.* East Hampton, Conn.: Memorial Elementary School, June 1981.

Cincinnati Public School System. *All-Day versus Half-Day Kindergarten Report.* 1971.

Criscuolo, Nicholas P. *Improving Classroom Reading Instruction.* Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1973.

Criscuolo, Nicholas P. "Most of the Kinder Going to the Garten." *New Haven Register, School Forum Column,* 21 March 1982.

Egertson, Harriet A. "The All Day Kindergarten: What Happens There Is What Counts." *Dateline, Education.* Lincoln: Nebraska Department of Education, 1981.

Elementary and Middle School Principals Association of Connecticut (EMSPAC). "All-Day Kindergarten." *Newsform* 5 (Summer 1981).

Ferguson-Florissant School District. *Expanding Early Education: The Extended Day Kindergarten.* U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, 1974. ED 107 367.

Gorton, Harry B. "For Better Results — A Full Day Kindergarten." *Education 89* (February 1969).

Gorton, Harry B., and Robinson, Richard. *A Study of the Kindergarten Program, Full-Day or Half-Day.* U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, 1968. ED 012 327.

Harris, C. C. "His Own Hello." *Young Children* 25 (December 1969).

Hatcher, Barbara A.; Schmidt, Velma E.; and Cook, James R. "Full-Day vs. Half-Day Kindergarten: No Difference." *Phi Delta Kappan* 61 (September 1979).

Headley, Neith. *The Kindergarten: Its Place in the Program of Education.* New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.

Herman, Barry E. *New Haven Public Schools All-Day Kindergarten Task Force Report.* Conn., 1981.

Herman, Barry E. "All-Day Kindergarten Works for Many Children." *New Haven Register*, 21 February 1983.

Hess, F. et al. *Kindergarten in American Education: A Discussion of Current Questions.* U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, 1978. ED 158 397.

Humphrey, Jack. *A Study of the Effectiveness of Full-Day Kindergarten.* Evansville, Ind.: Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation, 1980.

Jokubaitis, Thomas A. *Planning for All-Day Kindergarten: Report to Board of Education.* Stamford, Connecticut, 1980.

Johnson, Edith W. *An Experimental Study of the Comparison of Pupil Achievement in the All Day Kindergarten and One Half Day Control Group.* Ph.D. dissertation, Walden University, July 1974.

Kindergarten Evaluation Study: Full Day Alternate Day Programs. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, July 1972. ED 070 529.

Kindergarten: Extended Day. Saint Louis, Mo.: Division of Planning and Program Development, Saint Louis Public Schools, 1975.

Law, Norma R. " 'What is Early Childhood Education?': Some Definitions and Issues." *Childhood Education* 55 (February/March 1979).

Lester, Carolyn W. *Full-Day Kindergarten Resource Packet.* Hartford: Connecticut State Department of Education, 1982.

Morris, Earl W., ed. *Early Childhood Education in Illinois: Focus on Kindergarten.* U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, 1970. ED 080 201.

Mouw, Annabelle J. *The Description and Evaluation of the Alternate Day-Full Day Kindergarten Program.* U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, 1976. ED 129 435.

Naron, Nancy K. "Preschool Screening and Intervention: An Experiment in Early Investment." *Educational Economics* (March/April 1978).

Naron, Nancy K. "The Need for Full-Day Kindergarten." *Educational Leadership* 38 (January 1981).

Nieman, Ronald H., and Gastright, Joseph F. "The Long-Term Effects of Title I Preschool and All-Day Kindergarten." *Phi Delta Kappan* 63 (November 1981).

Rhinelander, Wisconsin, Board of Education. *Report on All-Day Kindergarten.* 1976.

Ross, E.D. *The Kindergarten Crusade: The Establishment of Preschool Education in the United States.* Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1976.

Solem, Maizie R. "Junior First Grade: A Year To Get Ready." *Phi Delta Kappan* 63 (December 1981).

Virginia State Department of Education. *A Guide For Kindergarten.* Richmond, 1975.

Winter, Mildred, and Klein, Alice E. *Extending the Kindergarten Day: Does it Make a Difference in the Achievement of Educationally Advantaged and Disadvantaged Pupils?* U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, 1970. ED 087 534.

Woods, Carol L. et al. *Evaluation of the ESEA Title I, Part B, Pilot Kindergarten Program.* U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, 1977. ED 148 479.

PDK Fastback Series Titles

1. Schools Without Property Taxes: Hope or Illusion?
3. Open Education: Promise and Problems
4. Performance Contracting: Who Profits Most?
7. Busing: A Moral Issue
8. Discipline or Disaster?
10. Who Should Go to College?
13. What Should the Schools Teach?
14. How to Achieve Accountability in the Public Schools
19. Sex Differences in Learning to Read
20. Is Creativity Teachable?
22. The Middle School: Whence? What? Whither?
23. Publish: Don't Perish
26. The Teacher and the Drug Scene
29. Can Intelligence Be Taught?
30. How to Recognize a Good School
31. In Between: The Adolescent's Struggle for Independence
37. General Education: The Search for a Rationale
41. Metrication, American Style
43. Motivation and Learning in School
44. Informal Learning
46. Violence in the Schools: Causes and Remedies
47. The School's Responsibility for Sex Education
56. Equity in School Financing: Full State Funding
57. Equity in School Financing: District Power Equalizing
59. The Legal Rights of Students
60. The Word Game: Improving Communications
62. The People and Their Schools: Community Participation
64. The Community as Textbook
65. Students Teach Students
66. The Pros and Cons of Ability Grouping
70. Dramatics in the Classroom: Making Lessons Come Alive
78. Private Schools: From the Puritans to the Present
79. The People and Their Schools
80. Schools of the Past: A Treasury of Photographs
81. Sexism: New Issue in American Education
83. The Legal Rights of Teachers
84. Learning in Two Languages
86. Silent Language in the Classroom
87. Multiethnic Education: Practices and Promises
88. How a School Board Operates
91. What I've Learned About Values Education
92. The Abuses of Standardized Testing
93. The Uses of Standardized Testing
95. Defining the Basics of American Education
96. Some Practical Laws of Learning
97. Reading 1967-1977: A Decade of Change and Promise
99. Collective Bargaining in the Public Schools
100. How to Individualize Learning
101. Winchester: A Community School for the Urbanvantaged
102. Affective Education in Philadelphia
103. Teaching with Film
104. Career Education: An Open Door Policy
105. The Good Mind
106. Law in the Curriculum
107. Fostering a Pluralistic Society Through Multi-Ethnic Education
108. Education and the Brain
109. Bonding: The First Basic in Education
110. Selecting Instructional Materials
111. Teacher Improvement Through Clinical Supervision
112. Places and Spaces: Environmental Psychology in Education
113. Artists as Teachers
114. Using Role Playing in the Classroom
115. Management by Objectives in the Schools
116. Declining Enrollments: A New Dilemma for Educators
117. Teacher Centers—Where, What, Why?
118. The Case for Competency-Based Education
119. Teaching the Gifted and Talented
120. Parents Have Rights, Too!
121. Student Discipline and the Law
122. British Schools and Ours
123. Church-State Issues in Education
124. Mainstreaming: Merging Regular and Special Education
125. Early Field Experiences in Teacher Education
126. Student and Teacher Absenteeism
127. Writing Centers in the Elementary School
128. A Primer on Piaget
129. The Restoration of Standards: The Modesto Plan
130. Dealing with Stress: A Challenge for Educators
131. Futuristics and Education
132. How Parent-Teacher Conferences Build Partnerships
133. Early Childhood Education: Foundations for Lifelong Learning
134. Teaching about the Creation/Evolution Controversy
135. Performance Evaluation of Educational Personnel
136. Writing for Education Journals
137. Minimum Competency Testing
138. Legal Implications of Minimum Competency Testing
139. Energy Education: Goals and Practices
140. Education in West Germany: A Quest for Excellence
141. Magnet Schools: An Approach to Voluntary Desegregation
142. Intercultural Education

(Continued on inside back cover)

See inside back cover for prices.

Fastback Titles *(continued from back cover)*

143. The Process of Grant Proposal Development
144. Citizenship and Consumer Education: Key Assumptions and Basic Competencies
145. Migrant Education: Teaching the Wandering Ones
146. Controversial Issues in Our Schools
147. Nutrition and Learning
148. Education in the USSR
149. Teaching with Newspapers: The Living Curriculum
150. Population, Education, and Children's Futures
151. Bibliotherapy: The Right Book at the Right Time
152. Educational Planning for Educational Success
153. Questions and Answers on Moral Education
154. Mastery Learning
155. The Third Wave and Education's Futures
156. Title IX: Implications for Education of Women
157. Elementary Mathematics: Priorities for the 1980s
158. Summer School: A New Look
159. Education for Cultural Pluralism: Global Roots Stew
160. Pluralism Gone Mad
161. Education Agenda for the 1980s
162. The Public Community College: The People's University
163. Technology in Education: Its Human Potential
164. Children's Books: A Legacy for the Young
165. Teacher Unions and the Power Structure
166. Progressive Education: Lessons from Three Schools
167. Basic Education: A Historical Perspective
168. Aesthetic Education and the Quality of Life
169. Teaching the Learning Disabled
170. Safety Education in the Elementary School
171. Education in Contemporary Japan
172. The School's Role in the Prevention of Child Abuse
173. Death Education: A Concern for the Living
174. Youth Participation for Early Adolescents: Learning and Serving in the Community
175. Time Management for Educators
176. Educating Verbally Gifted Youth
177. Beyond Schooling: Education in a Broader Context
178. New Audiences for Teacher Education
179. Microcomputers in the Classroom
180. Supervision Made Simple
181. Educating Older People: Another View of Mainstreaming
182. School Public Relations: Communicating to the Community
183. Economic Education Across the Curriculum
184. Using the Census as a Creative Teaching Resource
185. Collective Bargaining: An Alternative to Conventional Bargaining
186. Legal Issues in Education of the Handicapped
187. Mainstreaming in the Secondary School: The Role of the Regular Teacher
188. Tuition Tax Credits: Fact and Fiction
189. Challenging the Gifted and Talented Through Mentor-Assisted Enrichment Projects
190. The Case for the Smaller School
191. What You Should Know About Teaching and Learning Styles
192. Library Research Strategies for Educators
193. The Teaching of Writing in Our Schools
194. Teaching and the Art of Questioning
195. Understanding the New Right and Its Impact on Education
196. The Academic Achievement of Young Americans
197. Effective Programs for the Marginal High School Student
198. Management Training for School Leaders: The Academy Concept
199. What Should We Be Teaching in the Social Studies?
200. Mini-Grants for Classroom Teachers
201. Master Teachers
202. Teacher Preparation and Certification: The Call for Reform
203. Pros and Cons of Merit Pay
204. Teacher Fairs: Counterpoint to Criticism
205. The Case for the All-Day Kindergarten
206. Philosophy for Children: An Approach to Critical Thinking
207. Television and Children
208. Using Television in the Curriculum

This fastback and others in the series are made available at low cost through the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, established in 1966 with a bequest from George H. Reavis. The foundation exists to promote a better understanding of the nature of the educative process and the relation of education to human welfare.

Single copies of fastbacks are 75¢ (60¢ to Phi Delta Kappa members). Write to Phi Delta Kappa, Eighth and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402 **for quantity discounts for any title or combination of titles.**